



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,576	09/16/2003	Donald R. Dressler	GLDES/121/US	4496

2543 7590 02/02/2005  
ALIX YALE & RISTAS LLP  
750 MAIN STREET  
SUITE 1400  
HARTFORD, CT 06103

EXAMINER

JILLIONS, JOHN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3654

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/663,576

Applicant(s)

DRESSLER, DONALD R.

Examiner

John M. Jillions

Art Unit

3654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-13,15-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: page 5, line 20, “and” first occurrence should be ~~is~~.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Objections*

2. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 3, “roller” should be ~~roll~~. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benzing. Benzing discloses a roll assembly, Fig. 3, having a rigid cylindrical roll 4, a plastic carrier sheet 12 having an inner edge attached to the roll, and elastomeric friction strips 40 extending along each longitudinal edge of the carrier sheet. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the coefficient of friction of the friction strips 40 of Benzing is greater or should be made greater than the carrier strip on which the strips are supported inasmuch as the strips 40 are called “traction” strips, regarding claims 1, 15, 18. If the coefficient of friction of those strips were not greater then they might not function properly—i.e. would easily slide off of the carrier strip. Regarding claim 3 the particular thickness of the

Art Unit: 3654

carrier sheet of Benzing; the particular material of which the friction strips are made, re claim 5; the particular distance that the friction strips project above the surface of the carrier sheet, re claims 7 and 17; the particular material of which the roll is made, whether metal, plastic or paper re claims 9-11; whether the roll is a solid cylinder, re claim 12; the particular diameter of the roll, re claim 15 and the particular type of material being supported on the carrier strip, re claims 16 19 and 20 all would have been obvious design considerations to one of ordinary skill in the art depending on the stiffness of the carrier sheet desired, the particular type of material desired to be supported on the carrier strip, the thickness of such material (i.e. if the supported material were thin then the thickness of the friction strips could also be thin), because metal, plastic and paper rolls are old and well known in the art as are solid type cylindrical rolls, and because the diameter of the roll would have depended on the amount of material desired to be supported thereon. Regarding claim 6 it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the roll of Benzing could have been supported on any surface, including one having a lower coefficient of friction than the carrier sheet. Such placement of the roll on any desired surface such as for temporarily supporting the roll after winding would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art and would meet the terms of the claim.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 8 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3654

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Greener et al, Kamada et al and Arvidson are cited to show decurling devices, and Fauteux, Griffin, Campo, Ambrose, Gutshall, Richer and Volpi are cited to show various sheet storing devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Jillions whose telephone number is (703) 308-2685. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:15 - 5:45.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on (703) 308-2688. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



John M. Jillions  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3654

jmj